

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
OFFICE OF NUCLEAR ENERGY

Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP)
Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement

Office of Nuclear Energy
U.S. Department of Energy

Public Hearing and Invitation to Comment

November 20, 2008

7:40 p.m.

Best Western Hilltop House Hotel

400 Trinity Drive

Los Alamos, New Mexico

MR. BARRY LAWSON, Moderator

REPORTED BY: Cynthia C. Chapman, RMR, CCR #219
Bean & Associates, Inc.
Professional Court Reporting Service
500 Marquette, Northwest, Suite 280
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

JOB NO.: 1447D (CC)

1 (Public Comment Period Begins.)

2 MR. LAWSON: Okay. I'm ready to get
3 started. If you could take seats, please.

4 Okay. It's now time to receive your
5 formal comments on the scope of the proposed PEIS.
6 This is your opportunity to let DOE know what you
7 would like to see addressed in the draft document or
8 comments that you might have about what you have
9 read in there. Our court reporter will transcribe
10 your statement. And our court reporter this evening
11 is Cindy Chapman, who's sitting at the front here.

12 Let me review just a few of the ground
13 rules for the formal comments. These are listed on
14 the sheet that was made available to you when you
15 came in. I would ask you to please step to the
16 podium to my left here when your name is called,
17 introduce yourself and provide an organizational
18 affiliation if it's appropriate.

19 If you have a written version of your
20 statement, I would ask you to provide a copy to
21 either Cindy Chapman or myself after you have
22 completed your remarks. Also please give her any
23 additional attachments to your statement that you
24 wish to have entered on the formal record. Each of
25 these submittals will be labeled and given as part

1 of the inclusion in the formal record.

2 I'll call two or three names at a time so
3 that the on-deck speakers will know when they're up.
4 In view of the number of people that have asked to
5 speak, I am going to allow you five minutes for your
6 public statement. I will let you know when you have
7 a minute left. And we would ask you, as that time
8 approaches, you might even signal that you would
9 complete your comments as quickly, but as gracefully
10 as possible.

11 Now, we do not have a lot of people
12 speaking tonight. So I am going to just tell you if
13 you have more comments that go beyond five minutes,
14 I would just ask you to allow everyone who has
15 signed up to speak, and then you can come back and
16 add more comments if you choose to. Or if you
17 choose not to come back, you have the opportunity to
18 submit those comments in writing.

19 Mr. Golub will be sitting up here serving
20 as the hearing officer for the Department of Energy.
21 He will not be responding to any questions or
22 comments that are made during the session. And it
23 is at my discretion to call recesses if appropriate.
24 And given the number of people who are signed up to
25 speak, I suspect that I will call for a recess after

1 we have taken the speakers who are here who would
2 like to speak and are on my list.

3 We will recess at that point and give a
4 chance for you or for other people who might arrive
5 to change your mind about speaking, and I will bring
6 the session back into order if somebody would like
7 to speak during that recess. I will allow a fair
8 amount of time for people to change their mind
9 before we call an adjournment. You're certainly
10 welcome to stay around. We encourage you to do that
11 during those recesses.

12 Also, the court reporter has offered to
13 take private testimony from anybody who would prefer
14 not to speak in the public, but would like to give
15 the testimony to her during one of the recesses.

16 So I'm ready to go. And our first speaker
17 on my list is Susan Gordon. And Ms. Gordon will be
18 followed by Scott Kovac.

19 MR. GORDON: Thank you. I am Susan
20 Gordon, and I am the director of the Alliance for
21 Nuclear Accountability. We are a national network
22 of more than 36 local, regional and national
23 organizations representing the concerns of
24 communities in the shadows of the U.S. nuclear
25 weapons sites and radioactive waste dumps. Many of

1 our member organizations are in areas targeted for
2 reprocessing facilities, and they are gravely
3 concerned that their community will become nuclear
4 waste dumps, just like West Valley, New York;
5 Pocatello, Idaho; Richland, Washington; and Aiken,
6 South Carolina.

7 ANA objects to the Global National (sic)
8 Energy Partnership draft Programmatic Environmental
9 Impact Statement's support for reprocessing of
10 high-level radioactive waste. As stated in the
11 draft PEIS, GNEP intends to provide nuclear power
12 that is safe, secure and economical, while reducing
13 the impacts associated with spent nuclear fuel
14 disposal and reducing proliferation risks. ANA,
15 however, finds that the GNEP proposal would actually
16 exacerbate the inherent proliferation, cost, safety,
17 waste and security risks associated with nuclear
18 power.

19 GNEP is a Bush administration scheme to
20 revive the dangerous practice of reprocessing
21 irradiated nuclear fuel. GNEP would endanger the
22 environment, encourage nuclear bomb-making, squander
23 U.S. taxpayer dollars and deepen the nuclear waste
24 problem. Under the GNEP plan, some countries would
25 supply and fuel nuclear reactors for other as yet

1 unnamed countries that would agree to forgo uranium
2 enrichment and plutonium reprocessing. Once the
3 fuel rods would be irradiated, they would be sent
4 back to the suppliers for eventual reprocessing.

5 Reprocessing is the fundamental link
6 between a nuclear reactor and a plutonium bomb.
7 Irradiated or spent fuel is separated into its
8 constituent ingredients, usually using acid. One of
9 the ingredients, plutonium, can be used to make new
10 reactor fuel or nuclear bombs. Separated plutonium
11 encourages nuclear weapons proliferation.

12 This would perpetuate a system of
13 nuclear-have countries and nuclear-have-not
14 countries. This approach clearly has failed U.S.
15 foreign policy and has not served to stop countries
16 from attempting to obtain nuclear weapons or
17 technology to enable the development of nuclear
18 weapons.

19 The draft PEIS diminishes many of these
20 risks by minimizing the environmental impacts of
21 reprocessing and by not providing a full
22 proliferation risk or life-cycle cost analysis for
23 GNEP.

24 Furthermore, it overstates the need for
25 reprocessing by exaggerating projections of

1 increased U.S. nuclear power production capacity in
2 the future. Finally, the no-action alternative
3 supports funding for the Advanced Fuel Cycle
4 Initiative, which conducts research for
5 reprocessing. Instead of the preferred or no action
6 alternatives, the final PEIS should support the
7 establishment of hardened on-site storage of nuclear
8 waste.

9 DOE's contention that GNEP will reduce
10 waste volumes does not take into account the
11 environmental discharges from reprocessing
12 facilities. The history of reprocessing in the U.S.
13 and abroad has demonstrated that these facilities
14 have a catastrophic effect on the environment. The
15 reprocessing facility in West Valley, New York,
16 which was the site of the only U.S. commercial
17 reprocessing plant that operated for six years,
18 accumulated 600,000 gallons of high-level waste on
19 site. The tanks used to store this high level --
20 I'm sorry -- the tanks used to store this liquid
21 high-level waste must be cooled or the waste will
22 explode. In 1957, one such tank exploded in Russia
23 contaminating 6,000 square miles.

24 Liquid high-level waste from Cold War
25 reprocessing presents the greatest contamination

1 threat and cleanup challenge in the process. At
2 Hanford, Washington; Savannah River site,
3 South Carolina; and the Idaho National Laboratory,
4 millions of gallons of liquid waste sit in aging
5 tanks, all of which have leaked, threatening water
6 resources.

7 Since it's been online, the French
8 processing facility at La Hague has discharged
9 100 million gallons of radioactive liquid wastes
10 each year into the English Channel and continues to
11 blow gaseous forms of krypton-85 and carbon 14
12 downwind.

13 In the United Kingdom, the Sellafield
14 reprocessing facility has discharged 1,000 pounds of
15 plutonium into the Irish Sea. The draft PEIS must
16 address how DOE will handle waste streams that
17 include, but are not limited to, strontium, Cesium,
18 radioactive lanthanides, technetium, uranium and
19 krypton gas.

20 Despite that one of GNEP's fundamental
21 stated purposes is to reduce proliferation risks, no
22 analysis of GNEP's proliferation impacts is
23 provided. Instead, the National Nuclear Security
24 Administration plans to release a separate
25 nonproliferation assessment at a later date. This

1 is unacceptable. Due to the dramatic shift in U.S.
2 policy concerns by many independent experts and the
3 fundamental rationale for GNEP, the PEIS must
4 include a proliferation impact analysis.

5 The analysis should also include a risk
6 assessment that addresses the potential -- excuse
7 me -- for loss of nuclear material or diversion by
8 terrorists. In order for us to fully analyze GNEP,
9 all aspects of the program should be considered in
10 total, not as separate, unrelated components. This
11 draft PEIS does not include a life-cycle cost
12 estimate for GNEP. However, in the 1996 National
13 Academy of Sciences report, it estimated that a
14 reprocessing project like GNEP could cost more than
15 \$500 billion, and that was in 1996 dollars.

16 Additionally, the Congressional Budget
17 Office has stated that reprocessing of U.S. spent
18 fuel would cost 25 percent more than plans for
19 direct disposal in a permanent repository. Under
20 the current plan for GNEP, the taxpayer and rate
21 payers, not the nuclear power industry, would bear
22 this cost.

23 The Department of Energy must provide a
24 full cost analysis for GNEP and its impacts on both
25 rate payers and taxpayers.

1 In accordance with the Nuclear Waste
2 Policy Act of 1982, nuclear waste would eventually
3 be stored in a geologic repository. However,
4 disposal in a geologic repository is not the only
5 option available for managing nuclear waste and
6 other means, like waste storage in dry casks, needs
7 to be examined in this report. ANA supports the
8 Principles for Safeguarding Nuclear Waste at
9 Reactors. These principles, which are supported by
10 more than 100 national organizations in local
11 communities near reactors, would store reactor waste
12 in reinforced dry casks as near as possible to the
13 sources of generation. As a result, the waste can
14 be managed for 100 to 200 years while some of the
15 most radioactive elements, such as Cesium-137 and
16 strontium-90, decay away making the waste less
17 dangerous to handle.

18 MR. LAWSON: Another minute or so?

19 MR. GORDON: I'm almost done. Thank you.
20 This document is incomplete and should never have
21 been released. The goals and plans for GNEP have
22 shifted repeatedly since it was first proposed.
23 This is a symptom of a program that is trying to
24 justify itself.

25 The Bush administration is trying to push

1 its nuclear Renaissance during its last few days in
2 office. Nuclear power and reprocessing are not the
3 solution to climate change and will only serve to
4 divert money into the pockets of the nuclear
5 industry. It is time for this proposal to be
6 withdrawn.

7 I do want to voice my request of ANA
8 calling for the extension of the comment period.
9 I'm glad to hear that that is under consideration.
10 And I thank you for the opportunity to speak this
11 evening.

12 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Ms. Gordon. Next
13 speaker is Scott Kovac, to be followed by William
14 Stratton.

15 MR. KOVAC: Good evening. I'm Scott Kovac
16 of Nuclear Watch New Mexico. First off, we ask for
17 a longer comment period also. Sixty days is not
18 long enough to read and understand and comment on
19 this very technical issue.

20 Second off, we ask that this PEIS be
21 withdrawn due to its vagueness. Thank you.

22 The purpose of GNEP keeps changing. And
23 this PEIS seems to be looking for new ways to
24 support the nuclear power industry. DOE's Office of
25 Nuclear Energy is preparing this Programmatic

1 Environmental Impact Statement to assess the
2 potential environmental impacts of expanding nuclear
3 power in the United States. GNEP is not needed to
4 expand U.S. nuclear energy. If alternative nuclear
5 fuel cycles were financially viable, U.S. industry
6 would do this on its own without vast subsidies from
7 DOE and the taxpayers.

8 DOE is eliminating the chance for public
9 comment on a specific, preferred alternative to
10 closed fuel cycles. DOE's preference to close the
11 fuel cycle, which would recycle spent nuclear
12 fuel -- I'm sorry. DOE's preference is to close the
13 fuel cycle, which would recycle spent nuclear fuel.
14 DOE has not identified which specific closed fuel
15 cycle alternative is preferred.

16 DOE states that it will identify one or
17 more preferred alternatives in the final PEIS.
18 Waiting until the final PEIS to choose will
19 effectively deny the public a chance to comment on
20 the choice of the specific preferred alternative.

21 Where is the "Global" part of GNEP
22 tonight? At this time, DOE has no specific actions
23 for the international component of the GNEP program.
24 This PEIS also discusses international aspects of
25 the GNEP program that does not evaluate any proposed

1 actions or alternatives. DOE states that it will
2 make any decisions related to international
3 activities based on this PEIS. What will the
4 decisions related to international activities be
5 based on?

6 The GNEP draft PEIS does not contain a
7 nonproliferation assessment. The issue of
8 nonproliferation is not even addressed, having been
9 separated from the GNEP PEIS and placed in a
10 nonproliferation impact assessment that we are told
11 is being prepared by NMSA and available to be used
12 by U.S. DOE for its record of decision, but only
13 after these public hearings are over. This is
14 highly objectionable in considering the need to
15 formulate government policies that actually stop the
16 proliferation of nuclear weapons and a right of
17 citizens to know and provide the informed public
18 input on the underlying foundation of these
19 proposals.

20 What are the costs? A full accounting of
21 money spent to date and who were the recipients must
22 be given. The Department of Energy must also
23 provide a full cost analysis of all GNEP
24 alternatives and GNEP's impacts to both the
25 taxpayers and rate payers.

1 A glimpse of what may be coming. The
2 notice of intent DOE proposed to analyze in this --
3 in the notice of intent, DOE proposed to analyze the
4 construction of three facilities, one of which was
5 the advanced fuel cycle facility. DOE has since
6 decided not to propose construction and operation of
7 this advanced fuel cycle facility. Since DOE has
8 decided to eliminate the advanced fuel cycle
9 facility in its PEIS, which is the alternative that
10 replaces it?

11 GNEP must not come to LANL. LANL is one
12 of the DOE sites considered for the advanced fuel
13 cycle facility. The advanced fuel cycle facility
14 would be a large shielded facility of approximately
15 one million square feet. The LANL sitewide
16 Environmental Impact Statement states that the GNEP
17 advanced fuel cycle facility would generate up to
18 3,400 cubic yards of low-level radioactive waste,
19 4.4 cubic yards of mixed low-level waste, and
20 928 cubic yards of nondefense transuranic waste
21 annually, which is not eligible for disposal at
22 WIPP. This transuranic waste currently is without a
23 disposal pathway.

24 The LANL sitewide Environmental Impact
25 Statement also assessed -- gave us a hint of some of

1 the transportation aspects of GNEP at LANL. This
2 would include 39 shipments of light water reactor
3 spent fuel, 50 shipments of transmutation fuel, 50
4 shipments of fast water spent fuel and approximately
5 1,400 waste shipments. A study of the Los Alamos
6 County water system would be required to determine
7 whether the current water supply and distribution
8 systems were adequate to meet additional projected
9 annual water demand due to consolidated nuclear
10 production centered operations of the GNEP advanced
11 fuel cycle facility.

12 It is likely that significant
13 modifications would require -- would be required and
14 LANL would need to obtain greater water resources or
15 significantly reduce its potable water through these
16 mitigative measures.

17 Reprocessing does not solve reduced
18 radioactive waste problems. On the contrary, it
19 complicates it. Reprocessing generates numerous new
20 difficult-to-manage radioactive waste streams.
21 High-level liquid radioactive waste must be
22 resolidified into glass logs, a process that has
23 encountered technical difficulties at such sites as
24 Hanford, Washington, leading to skyrocketing --
25 which led to the skyrocketing costs. Once

1 vitrified, the high-level radioactive glass logs
2 require a deep geological repository.

3 Even then, fears persist that the intense
4 radioactivity and thermal heating of waste will
5 degrade the glass, leading to its release into the
6 environment over time. Thank you.

7 MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much. Next
8 speaker is William Stratton. Mr. Stratton will be
9 followed by Dominique Mazeaud. I hope I'm
10 pronouncing that correctly.

11 MR. STRATTON: My name is William
12 Stratton. And I'm a member of the Los Alamos
13 Education Group, a group of retired scientists who
14 are very much interested in appropriating, accurate,
15 truthful, real information on nuclear energy. We
16 try to cover the ballpark in all aspects of nuclear
17 energy.

18 I noticed in one part of the presentation
19 of the PEIS a mistake. I believe that an estimation
20 of the offsite doses and health consequences of some
21 part of the facility, you are using the "no
22 threshold" analysis for health effects. I think
23 this is incorrect. I think you should also consider
24 a threshold for the health effects which more fits
25 the real world.

1 I will be brief. We in the LAEG are
2 worried about, among other things, the supply of
3 electricity to the enormous electric power grid of
4 the whole nation. The national power grid was
5 judged by the National Academy of Sciences last -- a
6 few years -- a couple of years ago, to be the most
7 important -- most important engineering
8 accomplishment of the 20th century.

9 If you ask yourself what engineering
10 accomplishments should be considered, we could speak
11 of the automobile, airplanes, space travel,
12 computers and so on. But they decided that the
13 electric grid of the United States was a monumental
14 achievement, number one.

15 We worry about the supply of electricity
16 to this. Already, because of the worry of global
17 warming, burning coal, proposals to build coal-fired
18 electric generating stations are being rejected in
19 various states, I do not know how many. Now, we are
20 not in favor of burning coal, either. We'd much
21 rather fission uranium.

22 The PEIS is very clear, I believe, your
23 proposal of the closed fuel cycle, which is exactly
24 the way to go. The next to be done in the -- to
25 save the electric circuitry of the United States is

1 to commence design and building of chemical
2 processing or recycling plants for spent fuel, and
3 also to start the construction of one or two
4 medium-sized sodium cooled reactors.

5 I might point out that the rest of the
6 world is going this route, and we will be a pretty
7 poor nation if we do not have enough electricity in
8 50 years to satisfy the demands of the public and
9 the industry. The total demand of electricity in
10 this country and its maximum is somewhere up around
11 600,000 megawatts, an absolute staggering quantity.
12 Fifty percent is coal. Twenty percent is nuclear,
13 20 percent gas, and the rest is coal and the trivial
14 things like wind and solar.

15 I might make a comment about the
16 possibility of electricity supply in the national
17 grid from windmills and solar panels, and I think
18 that probably is zero. I would urge the Department
19 of Energy to stop using the PEIS as a stalling
20 document to avoid action. I think you should start
21 the design when the contractors -- hire the
22 contractors to design recycling plants or
23 reprocessing plants for spent fuel and start doing
24 this on a modest scale. One learns the problems of
25 the technology by trying to practice the technology.

1 The same holds for the sodium cooled
2 reactor. It's the only way we can foresee any
3 possibility of having electricity in the nation in
4 the future. This is the way to go, and I would urge
5 the DOE to commence these activities. Thank you.

6 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. The next
7 speaker is Dominique Mazeaud. Is that close?

8 MS. MAZEAUD: Very.

9 MR. LAWSON: She'll be followed by Sarah
10 Moore.

11 MS. MAZEAUD: I'm Dominique Mazeaud from
12 Santa Fe. I'm just a concerned citizen. I am
13 remembering first hearing I spoke about many, many
14 years ago about the WIPP, and already, I was
15 concerned about low-level nuclear waste. So here
16 we're talking of a much, much more serious problem.

17 And I'm really asking the DOE to extend
18 the comment period, because I know of many friends
19 who are concerned about these issues who couldn't be
20 here tonight and who are saving on gas and such
21 things and having three jobs to make it.

22 And I don't have a lot to say. But just
23 there are many, many voices. We heard a couple of
24 them, very learned voices earlier. To -- to add to
25 those recent studies by the National Academy of

1 Sciences Government Accountability Office, the
2 International Panel on Fissile Materials and Nuclear
3 Induced Responsive Report by the Houston Center have
4 refuted the claims of the Bush Administration that
5 GNEP would be a way to solve the nuclear waste
6 problem in the U.S. and support the expansion of
7 nuclear power. So they have refuted these claims
8 and expressed concerns regarding, as Ms. Gordon
9 said, dangerous pollution, nuclear proliferation and
10 exorbitant costs.

11 So I am totally against it. And I know I
12 have -- I know many voices who would like to be here
13 tonight and who would like to support my view.
14 Thank you.

15 MR. LAWSON: Okay. Thank you, ma'am.
16 Next speaker is Sarah Moore, Ms. Moore to be
17 followed by Penelope McMullen.

18 MS. MOORE: Good evening. I'm sorry, I
19 wasn't here to hear all the technical summation of
20 everything that's happening. However, I do feel
21 that it -- in its technicality, we've lost so much
22 of what we need to be taking into consideration.
23 Because right now, our world is this big to
24 everybody in this room. Right up here, all you have
25 to do is pick up your cell phone and you can go all

1 the way around the world. You can get on your
2 computer and you've already talked to Australia or
3 somewhere, probably go to the North or South Pole.

4 And we, in this small world, now are
5 holding the consideration of what makes our world
6 our world after we exploded a bomb, after we've had
7 nuclear accidents which we really don't like to talk
8 about. And after all of these little considerations
9 like Chernobyl, just in the -- in the sheer energy
10 that goes out to say we might have a problem, we
11 could have a problem.

12 And just because there is the possibility
13 of any type of problem, we need to think about what
14 energy really is and what we play a part in this
15 energy cycle as and how we play a part in creating
16 life or death or sustainability or disarmament or
17 peace. We're not the only nation that needs energy
18 in this world. But I do feel that, in giving our
19 technology out, as well as bringing it back here,
20 we're just creating more problems.

21 You have no answer. The second that you
22 started creating plants, you knew that we had waste.
23 We need something that doesn't create waste. We
24 need something that helps us all live peacefully
25 together and enjoy life and have food and water and

1 create more education for all of us so that we might
2 understand exactly what's going on here tonight,
3 because when you only have this many people out of
4 Los Alamos or Santa Fe, Albuquerque, who knows?
5 Nobody understands now.

6 This beautiful lady was talking about
7 people having three jobs, and it's wonderful to have
8 energy. But she can't -- they can't even pay for
9 it. All the plans that are coming out of Washington
10 now are nothing but tax things that we're going to
11 be spending anything we make on pretty soon. It's
12 time for all of us to consider what is free and
13 given to us every day, which is the sun, which is
14 our brain being able to find out answers and ask
15 questions, because we do have an answer for
16 anything, as long as we put our energy into it.

17 And we are all energy here. And if we
18 have the right questions and we care about each
19 other and we put love all around this world, we will
20 come up with a peaceful and viable solution. And
21 it's time for this whole world to get involved, not
22 just for us to think we have a solution to it. Even
23 though we have put and accused different nations of
24 having nuclear products, bombs or whatever direction
25 you like to go, we need to be the nation that shows

1 that there can be peace.

2 We are a nation that the whole world looks
3 to and admired for a couple of centuries. What
4 happened? Did we forget we were all under one
5 creator? Did we forget we all drink the same thing?
6 Did we forget we all have red blood? It's time for
7 all of us to find a solution, because our world is
8 too small for us not to all work together for one
9 thing. And this little world is going to be
10 responsible for our whole universe.

11 How many accidents could it take for us to
12 blow ourselves up as well as our solar system?
13 We've already got too much nuclear energy in space
14 that nobody knows how to control. It needs to be
15 thought out. It needs to be completely and
16 completely spoken to with your heart, because we
17 have no other solution for this.

18 We are a people, and we're all the same,
19 and we are responsible for everything on our planet,
20 and more. And we are against what's going on here
21 right now. We need more time. We need more people
22 to be thinking about this, because you have a very
23 knowledgeable public. All they have to do is press
24 Yahoo or Google and they can find this. But you
25 haven't let them know about it. All you hear about

1 it is one time on the news and then it's gone. It's
2 time for everybody to be accountable for this.
3 Thank you.

4 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, ma'am. Next
5 speaker is Penelope McMullen.

6 MS. McMULLEN: I have statements from two
7 different organizations, but I think they'll both
8 fit into the five minutes. I'm Penelope McMullen,
9 and I'm the regional justice and peace coordinator
10 for the Loretto Community of Sisters and Comembers.
11 The Loretto Community opposes the entire concept of
12 the global community partnership. In 1978, the
13 Loretto Community's general assembly passed a
14 resolution committing us to work to end the
15 production not only of nuclear weapons, but also of
16 nuclear power.

17 The next year, we published our
18 commitment, stating, quote, We view our opposition
19 to nuclear weapons and nuclear energy as an urgent
20 moral imperative.

21 We oppose the production of nuclear energy
22 because it carries the same risks to the environment
23 and to human health as the production of nuclear
24 weapons. History shows that workers in the nuclear
25 industry have a much higher rate of cancer and other

1 radiation-related illnesses and deaths. The Navajo
2 Nation has been especially hard hit, not only those
3 who worked in uranium mines, but also the livestock
4 and residents near the mines who continue to suffer
5 from the radioactive contamination from past mining
6 operations.

7 When I lived in New York State, I worked
8 with Dr. Rosalie Bertell, who is internationally
9 recognized for her studies of cumulative exposure to
10 low-level radiation. Her studies included workers
11 in the nuclear power industry. She started with
12 government funding, but when she began publishing
13 her results, her government funding was pulled.
14 Today's nuclear proponents claim that the industry
15 is safer now. But given the continued incidence of
16 security lapses, accidents and cover-ups and the
17 still growing numbers of cancers among workers and
18 in neighborhoods of nuclear plants, we do not trust
19 that this is safe enough.

20 There is also the huge, unsolved problem
21 of nuclear waste. It is insane to continue to
22 create such dangerous waste when we still do not
23 have a viable repository for it. While GNEP is a
24 plan to reprocess some of that waste, the entire
25 process looked at as a whole still creates more

1 waste.

2 Nuclear power is advertised as clean
3 because it emits little CO2 when the consumer uses
4 it. But the entire process of producing it, from
5 mining on, actually contributes to global warming.
6 Nuclear energy also requires a much higher federal
7 subsidy than renewable energy sources. And by the
8 time GNEP could be operational, the renewable energy
9 industry will be sufficiently developed that nuclear
10 energy will already be obsolete.

11 With the huge amount of comments opposing
12 the GNEP, the second highest number in DOE history,
13 we wonder why DOE continues to waste taxpayer time
14 and money on pursuing this plan any further. We are
15 glad that you are thinking of an extension of time
16 for comments. The current deadline -- I'll skip
17 that.

18 The nonproliferation assessment is not yet
19 available for public review. So we request an
20 additional 180 days following the release of that
21 assessment. And there are quite a few specific
22 problems with the draft PEI which I will address in
23 my written comments.

24 The second statement comes from a group
25 called Las Mujeres Hablan, which means, "The women

1 speak." This statement is signed by Marian Naranjo
2 from Honor Our Pueblo Assistance; Sheri Kotowski
3 from Embudo Valley Environmental Monitoring Group;
4 Clarissa Duran from Community Service Organization
5 del Norte; and Joni Arends from Concerned Citizens
6 for Nuclear Safety.

7 The undersigned women from North Central
8 New Mexico, known as Las Mujeres Hablan, make the
9 following comments about the proposal by the
10 Department of Energy about a Global Nuclear Energy
11 Partnership. It is a proposal to restart nuclear
12 waste reprocessing in the United States. History
13 tells us that the previous attempt at commercial
14 reprocessing failed miserably in West Valley,
15 New York, and has left behind a huge legacy in
16 radioactive toxic and hazardous waste. The GNEP
17 proposal threatens local communities, such as ours,
18 which are located downwind and downstream of Los
19 Alamos National Laboratory. The GNEP proposal
20 threatens global security.

21 We urge DOE to stop pursuing the
22 environmentally destructive, dangerous, and
23 exorbitantly expensive GNEP program and store
24 nuclear waste at reactor sites and enhance the
25 safety and security at the sites as recommended by

1 many governmental oversight agencies and boards.

2 The analysis provided in the draft
3 Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement is
4 simply inadequate. Despite the legal mandate under
5 the National Environmental Policy Act to analyze the
6 full socioeconomic and environmental impacts of
7 GNEP, DOE has not included a complete life cycle
8 cost analysis of the draft PEIS, nor do they fully
9 address the environmental and nonproliferation
10 impacts.

11 In fact, the nonproliferation assessment
12 is still not available for public review.
13 Furthermore, the draft inadequately addresses the
14 full extent of health impacts from reprocessing.
15 Ignoring thousands of letters from the public and
16 repeated requests from Congress, DOE has still not
17 provided, and this PEIS does not include, a total
18 life-cycle cost of GNEP, including all of the
19 reprocessing facilities, fast reactors and fuel
20 fabrication facilities required to fully implement
21 GNEP.

22 To be complete, any analysis must include
23 cleanup of the research and development facilities,
24 such as LANL, the reprocessing facilities, as well
25 as decommissioning of fast reactors and fuel

1 fabrication facilities. No analysis of GNEP's
2 proliferation risks or impacts is provided.

3 Instead, the draft states that the National Nuclear
4 Security Administration is providing a separate
5 nonproliferation assessment but fails to provide any
6 clear timetable for its release.

7 For the public to fully assess the impacts
8 of GNEP, a nonproliferation analysis must be
9 included within the PEIS. Because the essential
10 nonproliferation assessment is not yet available, we
11 therefore request an extension time of 100 days
12 following release of the assessment to provide
13 comments.

14 Further, the draft PEIS inaccurately
15 argues that reprocessing reduces the total volume of
16 waste and therefore limits long-term health impacts
17 related to disposal. This argument not only ignores
18 recent independent studies that conclude
19 reprocessing does not diminish the volume of waste,
20 but also contradicts a previous section of the
21 report that explicitly states reprocessing will not
22 diminish the need for the -- for waste disposal.

23 DOE must describe how it is going to
24 manage and protect workers, the public and the
25 environment from the many radioactive toxic and

1 hazardous waste streams that result from all phases
2 of the GNEP plan. These wastes include, but are not
3 limited to, strontium, Cesium, radioactive
4 lanthanides, technetium, uranium and krypton gas.
5 In addition, DOE must describe how any GNEP work
6 will impact drinking water supplies.

7 Reprocessing is polluting, expensive and a
8 threat to U.S. national security. We strongly
9 recommend that DOE abandon this dangerous GNEP
10 proposal and focus its efforts on safe to
11 safeguarding nuclear waste at reactor sites.

12 MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much. I would
13 just say to you and to others who have statements,
14 if you have a written copy of that that you'd be
15 willing to give to the court reporter, that would be
16 appreciated. If you don't, that's fine, too.

17 That's all the people I have on my list.
18 Before I recess, is there anybody here who would
19 like to make a statement before I go to recess?

20 Okay. This is how we're going to work
21 this. I'm going to call a recess. And when I do, I
22 will be available. If anybody would like to make a
23 statement, just come and tell me about it and we'll
24 reopen the hearing so that you can make that
25 statement. Also, I remind you that the court

1 reporter has offered, if anyone would, during the
2 recess like to make a statement private with her,
3 you may do so.

4 Often when we take a recess, some people
5 take that opportunity to leave, and if you do, I
6 want to thank you very much for coming, and I
7 certainly want to express appreciation to those of
8 you who have spoken. I know all the work that goes
9 into preparing those statements, and I'm sure that
10 the Department appreciates the work that you've done
11 in putting those statements together.

12 So at this point, you are certainly
13 welcome to stay around and talk and discuss, ask
14 questions, whatever you'd like to do. But for now,
15 this hearing is recessed and will be reconvened when
16 somebody says they'd like to speak, or when I judge
17 that we have exhausted the opportunity and it's time
18 to go home. Thank you. This meeting is now
19 recessed.

20 (A recess was taken.)

21 MR. LAWSON: Okay. I'd like to call the
22 hearing back into session, please. We have one more
23 speaker before we adjourn. And if you'll take your
24 seats, please. Okay, thank you. Next speaker, and
25 probably our last speaker, is Catherine Montaña.

1 Ms. Montaña.

2 MS. MONTAÑO: My name is Catherine
3 Montaña, and I'm from Las Vegas, New Mexico. And I
4 have sat in nuclear hearings 18 years of my life.
5 And not by choice. It was a divine calling. I was
6 physically thrown out of my bed and I was told by
7 God that I had to get involved in stopping the
8 nuclear madness. And at the time, I thought, what
9 does that mean?

10 I grew up in Las Vegas, New Mexico. We're
11 downwind from Los Alamos Labs. I knew that
12 Los Alamos worked on bombs, but that is all I knew.
13 I couldn't even pronounce the word "plutonium." I
14 used to ask the angry women and men, "How do you say
15 that word," until I learned it. And then I sat in
16 these hearings, and I heard nothing but devastation
17 about nuclear energy, nuclear technology.

18 From mining it and milling it to using it
19 as nuclear energy, I have listened to thousands and
20 thousands of people cry. We have cried oceans of
21 tears because we are in a nuclear holocaust. The
22 gentleman that came up earlier said that we only use
23 20 percent nuclear energy. I just want to show you
24 a map of the United States. And this is an old map.
25 I wish it was very recent so that it would scare you

1 even more when you look at it. This map right here
2 shows nuclear bombs that we have detonated. It
3 shows uranium mines. It shows nuclear reactors. It
4 shows nuclear submarines. Heaven knows how many of
5 them are wrecked in the ocean or down in our waters.
6 How much nuclear waste has the United States and the
7 world dumped into the oceans? How much waste have
8 we hid in the mountains? This is only 20 percent
9 nuclear energy, and we are in a crisis.

10 When we make nuclear bombs and we drop it,
11 so-called enemy. We drop it on innocent people. We
12 drop it on our own fighting men. They come back
13 sick. I've worked with many, many veterans, and
14 it's sad to say that the Department of Defense,
15 first they brainwash them, they use them and they
16 abuse them, and then when they finish with them,
17 they spit them out like trash. Because when they're
18 sick, they ignore them. And, you know, it is sad
19 that this vicious circle continues, and we must stop
20 it.

21 And I just want to say to the Department
22 of Energy, they call themselves the DOE. For me,
23 "DOE" stands for the Devils of the Earth, because
24 they continue to destroy life on the planet. And we
25 only have one earth. Last year, we put out a

1 constitutional letter to our state government. And
2 some of these senators didn't like it when I went up
3 to them, and I told them, they took an oath to
4 protect us, and they better start meeting their
5 constitution. But in the Constitution, in
6 Article 20, Section 21, it says no pollution of our
7 air, water, natural resources.

8 Well, here in New Mexico, we are drinking
9 radioactive water. We are breathing radioactivity.
10 Los Alamos continues their criminal acts on the
11 human race and all life on the planet. So does
12 Kirtland and Sandia, White Sands. You name the
13 nuclear facility around the country, and they have
14 grossly contaminated the ecosystems of the
15 United States. We must stop the nuclear madness.
16 If we do not stop this obsolete technology, there
17 will be no life for none of us or no future for our
18 children. And we are supposed to protect seven
19 generations, and we can't even protect this
20 generation.

21 So I tell the Department of Energy, a lot
22 of you took an oath, and we will hold you
23 accountable. I belong to a group called Citizens of
24 the American Constitution. We have won over
25 300 cases. The Constitution of the United States is

1 the supreme law of the land. And all of this
2 wording that the Department of Energy continues to
3 put into books, you know, we pay for all this. And
4 most of it goes in the trash.

5 You know, we're tired of that. We've got
6 people that are starving. We live in the sunbelt.
7 Eighty percent of the time, the sun shines. We have
8 wind power. We can have photovoltaic. We can have
9 many clean technologies. We do not need a
10 technology that we do not know how to control.

11 Just like the WIPP Isolation Pilot Plant.
12 Bill Richardson and Tom Udall, at one time they were
13 my heroes, because they stood up and said if WIPP
14 would not meet the science, they would make sure and
15 fight and stop it. They didn't stop it. Why?
16 Because they sold out.

17 I am tired of corporations that come in to
18 poor states like New Mexico and buy out our
19 politicians. They remind me of prostitutes. They
20 get the money, and then they forget who put them in
21 office. Thank God that we have the Constitution of
22 the United States and the Constitution of New Mexico
23 that protects the people. And it is time for the
24 people to stand up against the Devils of the Earth,
25 because I know that down at WIPP, they have the

1 grays. Some of you might not know. What do you
2 mean by "the grays"? They're aliens. They're
3 devils.

4 And that's what the Department of Energy
5 works with. And they need the plutonium to maneuver
6 their ships. We all know that. When President
7 Senior Bush was President, Channel 13 even announced
8 it on Channel -- 6:00 news. Dulce, New Mexico, UFOs
9 coming out like a hornet's nest. I was so glad to
10 hear it on television, because we know that they
11 want to bring all these nukes into our state to
12 continue their black projects.

13 And we're fed up. We're fed up in seeing
14 our people dying of cancer, diabetes, radiation
15 exposure. I'm tired of seeing all our dead trees.
16 I'm tired of seeing our cats and our dogs dying of
17 cancer and diabetes. What kind of a humanity are we
18 to continue a product like plutonium, the most
19 deadly chemical known to man, that we don't know how
20 to control? They think because they've buried it in
21 a salt mine full of water, that it's a solution.

22 But if, as I recall, harsh terrain is the
23 most dangerous terrain to store nuclear waste. And
24 the Department of Energy and the Department of
25 Defense has gone against science. And when you go

1 against science, that's a criminal act, a criminal
2 act against humanity and all life on the planet.

3 All atomic activity must cease upon --
4 must cease upon the earth. There's no safe way of
5 storing it or disposing of it, and nuclear
6 facilities are making too much of it. This is the
7 greatest crime to humanity and all life on the
8 planet in the universe. And we want this stopped.
9 We don't want it in our state. We don't want it
10 anywhere in the United States.

11 You, Department of Energy and Department
12 of Defense, it is time that you address what the
13 messes that you have done around the country and
14 around the world. We cannot continue this, because
15 if we do not open our eyes and see what is going on,
16 there's no future for none of us. And it's sad to
17 see children being born without arms and legs,
18 without brains, without hearts.

19 MR. LAWSON: One minute, please.

20 MS. MONTAÑO: It's evil. It's criminal.
21 So I just want to put on notice to my elected
22 officials from the city to the county to the state
23 government to the federal government that we will
24 hold you accountable. You took an oath to protect
25 us, and it is time that we unseat you and we sue

1 you, civilly and criminally. And we will do that if
2 you continue this nuclear madness. We are not going
3 to put up with it no more.

4 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Is there anyone
5 else who would like to speak? Okay. Well, thank
6 you all very much for attending. And for those of
7 you who made presentations, in a minute, this will
8 conclude the public hearing on the Draft GNEP PEIS.
9 I would note once again that the comment period
10 right now stands at -- to end on December 16th. But
11 we have a strong suspicion that it may be extended
12 another 60 days, but that has not been officially
13 announced.

14 Before we break, I would like to also
15 thank Cindy Chapman, who is the court reporter, for
16 a good job tonight, remind you that there are
17 comment sheets if you have other comments you'd like
18 to make subsequent to this meeting. Mr. Golub, do
19 you have any final comments?

20 MR. GOLUB: No.

21 MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much,
22 appreciate it. This meeting is now adjourned.

23 (Proceedings adjourned at 8:45 p.m.)
24
25

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
OFFICE OF NUCLEAR ENERGY

Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP)
Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement

Office of Nuclear Energy
U.S. Department of Energy

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Cynthia C. Chapman, RMR, CCR #219, Certified
Court Reporter in the State of New Mexico, do hereby
certify that the foregoing pages constitute a true
transcript of proceedings had, held in the District
of New Mexico, in the matter therein stated.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my
hand on November 24, 2008.

Cynthia C. Chapman, RMR, CCR #219
500 Marquette, NW, Suite 280
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

Job No.: 1447D

RECEIPT

JOB NUMBER: 1447D CC Date: 11/20/08

PROCEEDINGS: PUBLIC COMMENTS HEARING

MATTER: GNEP Draft PEIS

ATTORNEY: JACKIE BOLTZ

DOCUMENT: Transcript / Exhibits / Disks / Other _____

DATE DELIVERED: _____ DEL'D BY: _____

REC'D BY: _____ TIME: _____

ATTORNEY:

DOCUMENT: Transcript / Exhibits / Disks / Other _____

DATE DELIVERED: _____ DEL'D BY: _____

REC'D BY: _____ TIME: _____

ATTORNEY:

DOCUMENT: Transcript / Exhibits / Disks / Other _____

DATE DELIVERED: _____ DEL'D BY: _____

REC'D BY: _____ TIME: _____

ATTORNEY:

DOCUMENT: Transcript / Exhibits / Disks / Other _____

DATE DELIVERED: _____ DEL'D BY: _____

REC'D BY: _____ TIME: _____